

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SC 9990)  
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)  
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5056  
FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

**\*E-FILED - 5/2/07\***

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. 07-00043 RMW
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	STIPULATION AND <input type="checkbox"/>
v.	)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
	)	
RYAN ALEXANDER and	)	
CHARLES ALEXANDER,	)	
	)	SAN JOSE VENUE
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

On April 19, 2007, the undersigned parties made an initial appearance before the Court in the above-captioned matter. At the hearing, Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight explained to the Court that the government had met with Joshua Bentley, who represents Ryan Alexander, and Jonathan McDougall, who represents Charles Alexander, and needs additional time to investigate issues that were raised during the meeting. Due to the conflicting vacation and work schedules, the parties requested a status date of July 9, 2007. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from April 19, 2007 to July 9, 2007. The defendants', through Joshua Bentley, agreed to the exclusion. The parties agreed and stipulated that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendants' need for continuity

STIPULATION AND ☐ ORDER  
No. 07-00043 RMW

1 and effective preparation of counsel.

2 SO STIPULATED:

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
United States Attorney

4 DATED: 4/25/07

/s/  
SUSAN KNIGHT  
Assistant United States Attorney

6 DATED: 4/25/07

/s/  
JOSHUA M. BENTLEY  
Counsel for Ryan Alexander

9 DATED: 4/25/07

/s/  
JONATHAN D. MCDOUGALL  
Counsel for Charles Alexander

12 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act  
13 from April 19, 2007 to July 9, 2007. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that  
14 the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the  
15 public and the defendants in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would  
16 deny both defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into  
17 account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court  
18 therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A)  
19 and (B)(iv).

20 SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: 5/2/07

  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge